

# THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF  
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

**B. LEWIS, CH. PELLAT AND J. SCHACHT**

ASSISTED BY J. BURTON-PAGE, C. DUMONT AND V. L. MÉNAGE AS  
EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME II

**C—G**

FOURTH IMPRESSION



LEIDEN  
**E. J. BRILL**  
1991

al-Kalkāshandī, *Ṣubḥ al-A‘shā*, v : 64; *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam*, 372; al-Idrisī, *Nuṣṣat al-Mushtak* (extracts), ‘Aligāfī 1954, 28; Abdul Hamid Khan, *Towns of Pakistan*, Karachi n.d., 59-69; *Journal of the Sind Historical Society*, May 1934, 3 ff.; J. McMurdo in *JASB*, 1834; Sulayman Nadwī in *JPakHS*, i, 1953, 8-14; N. B. Baloch, *The most probable location of Daibul, the first Arab settlement in Sind, in Dawn*, Karachi, February (4, 18), 1951; *Dīwaynī*, ii, 94, 142-8; *Dīwaynī-Boyle*, ii, 411 ff.; Sidi Ali Reis, *Travels and Adventures*, London 1899, 38; *Čačnāma* (ed. U. M. Daudpota), Dihlī 1358/1936, 89-91, 100-10; al-Bīrūnī, *Kānūn-Mas‘ūdi*, Ḥaydarābād 1955, ii, 552; *Marāṣid al-I‘ṭilā*, Tehrān 1310/184; al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ* 432, 435-8, 443; Le Strange 331; H. Cousens, *The Antiquities of Sind*, Calcutta 1925, 124 ff.; Elliot and Dowson, *The history of India as told by its own historians*, London 1867, index; H. G. Raverty, *The Mihran of Sind*, Calcutta 1892 (special issue of *JASB*); M. R. Haig, *The Indus Delta Country*, London 1894, 42 ff.; J. Abbot, *Sind*, Oxford 1924, 43-55; al-Bīrūnī, *Kitāb mā li’l-Hind* (transl. E. Sachau, London 1914, 205, 208, 260, 316; Ya‘kūbī, ii, 330-1, 345-6, 448; Tabarī, i, 868; Ibn al-Athīr, *Ta’rīkh* (Cairo ed.), iv, 257-8; Minhādī-i Sirādī, *Ṭabaḳāt-i Naṣīrī* (transl. Raverty, i, 294, 295 n, 452 n2; *Djawālīkī*, *Mu‘arrab*, 67; Muḥammad Ṭāhir Nasyānī, *Ta’rīkh-i Ṭāhīrī* (MS), Muḥaddasī, 481-4; *TA*, under the root *D’B’L*; N. B. Baloch, *The most probable site of Debal...*, in *IC*, xxvi/3, 1952, 35-49.

(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

**DAYDABĀN**, from Persian *dīdebān*, a term applied at different times to certain categories of sentinels, watchmen, inspectors, etc. It already appears as the name of a profession in the *Rasā’il Iḥwān al-Safā* (8th *risāla* of 1st series, ed. Cairo, i, 210; cf. *IC*, 1943, 147), together with the *Nātūr*. In classical Ottoman usage the term, pronounced *Dīdebān*, was applied to the Customs-house guards, whose chief was the *Dīdebān baṣī*. It was also given to the watchmen on the fire-towers in Istanbul, as well as to naval and military look-outs.

**Bibliography:** Dozy, *Supplément*, i, 481; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti teşkilâtından Kapıkulu Ocakları*, i, Ankara 1943, 394; M. Z. Pakalın, i, 450. (Ed.)

**DAYF**. From the basic meaning “to incline towards, to set (of the sun), swerve, glance off (of an arrow)”, the verbal root comes to mean “to turn aside (from one’s road)” and “to halt, on a visit to someone”, whence for the noun the sense of “guest”; the meaning “host”—recalling the ambivalence of the French *hôte*—also occurs, but very much later, as indicated by Dozy, *Suppl.* (‘*maître de maison*’). The social implications of the right to protection were earlier associated with the word *djār* [q.v.], the corresponding Hebrew word *gēr* (but not exactly parallel; see *DJWĀR*) attesting the same Semitic institution. It is curious that the root of this word shows the some semantic derivation from “deviate” to “descend, stay with someone”. For a short bibliography, see *DAKHİL*. (J. LECERF)

**DAYĪ**, Turkish word meaning “maternal uncle”, which seems to have been used to designate official functions only in the Regencies of Algiers and Tunis. It probably began as a sort of honorific title (comparable to the word *alp*, used by the ancient Turks), and must have been difficult to acquire, as its bearer had to have demonstrated his prowess on land and sea in the Mediterranean (Pakalın, i, 407-8). This usage would conflict with the legend

in which the father of the Barbarossas is supposed to have told his sons to obey Khayr al-Din [q.v.] for “he will be your day” (*Venture de Paradis, Alger au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in *RA*, 1896, 257).

Another use of the honorific title was to designate a lower rank in the Janissary militia; towards the end of the 16th/17th century in Tunis, the name was born by the heads of the 40 sections of the militia. In 1591 these *dayīs* elected one of their number to the command of the army; this supreme *dayī* held the whole of the power in the Regency of Tunis, at least from 1594, allowing the *beylerbeyi-paṣha* to remain in office but with only nominal power (Pierre Dan, *Histoire de la Barbarie et de ses Corsaires*, Paris 1637, 144-5). Ḥamūda b. Murād, when he came into power in 1640 allowed the title of *dayī* to continue, but the person who bore it was no longer the head of the Regency, even if he remained one of its highest dignitaries.

After 1705, the word *dayī* is no longer to be found among the titles conferred by the Ḥusaynid sovereigns, but still appears in the Tunisian hierarchy, in the ninth rank, according to Muḥammad Bayrām al-Khāmis al-Tūnūsī (*Safwat al-I‘tibār*, Cairo 1302/1885, ii, 2-3); it is found in several diplomatic documents of the eighteenth century, particularly in the treaties drawn up between the Regency of Tunis and France on 16th December, 1710, 9th November, 1742, and 4 Ventôse, Year X. The word at that time referred to a high judicial officer. It seems to have continued up to the middle of the 19th century.

In Algiers, after 1671, when the Corsair Captains took over the power of the Aghas (see art. ALGERIA (ii) (2)), the title of *dayī* was borne by the head of the Regency. This was not yet the case at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Pierre Dan was in Algiers.

Elected at first by the company (*tā’ifa*) of corsair masters, the *dayī* was elected by the officers of the army after 1689. Thirty *dayīs* succeeded each other in power between 1671 and 1830. In theory their power was limited by the control of the *dīwān* of the militia; in fact if the *dayī* had a strong personality, he enjoyed an absolute power.

The *dayī* resided in Algiers, first in the palace of the *Djanina*, on the site where the archbishop’s palace now stands, then after 1816, in the fortress called the *Kaṣba*, which dominates the Muslim town. The private life of the ruling *dayī* was strictly regulated: he lived apart from his family, except on Thursday afternoons and the night of Thursday/Friday, which he could spend in his private house. No woman could enter his palace, except for a public audience. He was entitled only to the high pay of a Janissary and to allocations of provisions, but he received numerous presents as well, so that several *dayīs* amassed considerable fortunes. Fourteen of them died a violent death.

**Bibliography:** No books or articles are specially concerned with the function of *dayī*; some scattered information can be found in sources or studies relating to the Turkish regencies of Algiers and Tunis. (R. LE TOURNEAU)

**DAYLAM**, geographically speaking, the highlands of Gilān [q.v.]. In the south, the lowlands of Gilān proper are bounded by the Alburz range; the latter forms here a crescent, the eastern horn of which comes close to the Caspian coast (between Lāhījān and Čālūs). In the centre of the crescent there is a gap through which the Saifd-rūd, formed on the central Iranian plateau, breaks through

towards the Caspian Sea. Before entering the gorge at Mandjil the river, flowing here from west to east, receives a considerable tributary, the *Shāh-rūd*, which, rising in the district of *Tālakān* and flowing east to west, skirts the southern face of the Alburz wall. On its southern side the basin of the *Shāh-rūd* is separated by a line of hills from the plain of *Kāzwin* [q.v.], while on its right side it is fed by a number of streams flowing down the southern slopes of the Alburz. The principal of these tributaries is that watering the valley of *Alamūt* [q.v.]. The valleys of the *Shāh-rūd* and its tributaries seems to be the cradle of the Daylamite tribe. Though belonging to the basin of the great river of *Gilān* (the *Safid-rūd*), 'Daylam proper' (*al-Daylam al-mahd*) is in fact separated from it by the Alburz wall. The Daylamites also occupied the northern slopes of the mountain and its ramifications stretching towards the sea (see *Hudūd al-'Ālam*), and Daylam formed here a wedge between *Gilān* and *Ṭabaristān* [q.v.].

While *Gilān* is marshy and unhealthy but highly fertile, the highlands of Daylam, much less favoured by nature, were inhabited by a robust and enterprising race of men ready to emigrate or serve abroad. The geographical term 'Daylam' followed the destinies of the Daylamite expansion in the 4th/10th century, and came to comprise many other neighbouring lands (see below).

The ancient period. The remote origins of the Daylamites are uncertain. They probably belonged to a pre-Iranian stock. The name of the peak of *Dulfak* (or *Dalfak*), which rises on the right bank of the *Safid-rūd* gorge to the north-east of *Mandjil*, has been compared to the name of the ancient tribe of *Δρῖβυκες*. The name of the Daylamites is known to many classical writers. In the 2nd century B. C. *Polybius*, v, 44, mentions the northern neighbours of *Media*: \**Δελυμαῖοι*, \**Ἀναρῖακαί*, ('non-Aryans'), \**Καδοῦσιοι*, \**Ματιάνοι*. In the 2nd century A.D., *Ptolemy*, vi, 2, places \**Δελυμαῖς* to the north of *Choromithrene* (*Kh*\**ār-u Waramīn*, to the south-east of *Rayy*), and to the west of the *Tapuri* (*Ṭabaristān*). On the Iranian side the information begins to emerge only in *Sāsānian* times. Before the decisive victory of *Ardashīr* the *Sāsānian* over *Ardavān* the *Arsacid* the latter is said to have mobilized "the troops of *Rayy*, *Damāwand*, *Daylamān*, and *Paṭishkh*" (*Kārnāmak-i Artakshīr*, tr. *Nöldeke*, 47). This would suggest *Arsacid* influence established among the population of the southern face of the Alburz range. At first the *Sāsānians* treated the Daylamites with caution (see *Marquart*, *Erānsahr*, 126) but gradually the latter became conspicuous both in the army and at the court. *Kāwād* sent an expedition against *Iberia* (*Georgia*) under the command of a "Persian" whose name *Boēs* (\**Bōya*) and title *Οὐαρτζης* (\**wahriz*) point, however, to his Daylamite connexions (see *Procopius*, *De bello persico*, i, 14). Under *Khusraw Anūshīrwān* a detachment of Daylamites is mentioned (ca. 552 A.D.) at the siege of *Archeopolis* (now *Tsikhe-Godji*) in *Lazica* where they were used as expert cragsmen, while the *Turkic Sabirs* were leading the frontal attack (see *Procopius*, *De bello gothico*, iv, 14 ed. *Dindorf*, 529-30). A few years later the Daylamites carried out an unsuccessful night attack on another corps of *Sabirs* employed by the *Byzantines* (see *Agathias*, iii, 17) According to *Procopius*, the "Dolomites" lived in inaccessible mountains; they were never subjects of the kings of *Persia*, and served them only as mercenaries. They fought on foot, each man being armed with a sword and a shield, and

carrying three javelins (*acontia*) in his hands, which corresponds to the later *Islamic* descriptions.

*Khusraw I*'s famous expedition to the *Yemen* (ca. 570 A.D.) consisted of 800 prisoners from *Daylam* and neighbouring places, and was led by an old man, also released from prison, bearing the title of *wahriz* [q.v.]. When under *Kāwād* and *Khusraw* the passes of the *Caucasus* were fortified and military colonies settled near them, the names of the latter reflected their origin from *Daylam* and its neighbourhood (see below, *Toponymy*). The conspiracy against *Khusraw*'s successor *Hurmizd IV*, which resulted in his overthrow in 590 A.D., was led by *Zoanab*, the chief of the "Dilimitic" people (*Theophylactus Simocatta*, iv, 3, 1).

*Daylam* and the *Arabs*. During the *Arab* invasion the Daylamites took up an indecisive position when the people of *Kāzwin* invoked their help, but, supported by the people of *Rayy*, they opposed *Nu'mān b. Muḳarrin* sent by the caliph 'Umar. The Daylamites, led by their king (chief?) *Mūtā* (or *Mūrthā*), were defeated on the river *Wādj* in *Dastabay* (\**Dasht-pay*, i.e., the "edge of the plain" stretching between *Rayy* and *Hamadān*) (*Ṭabarī*, i, 265 (sub 22/642)). *Balādhuri*, 317-25, and other historians mention seventeen Muslim expeditions into *Daylam*, from the time of 'Umar I to that of *al-Ma'mūn*, which were reflected in *Arabic* poems (see *Kasrawī*, 4-20). The poet *A'shā Hamdān* (d. 83/702) was kept a prisoner by the Daylamites, though the place-names he quotes (*Ḳlism*, *Ḳayūl*, *Hāmin*, *Lahzamin*) seem to refer to the region of *Damāwand* (*Wima*?). Nevertheless *Daylam* preserved its independence. The Muslim strongholds against them were in the south: *Kāzwin*; and in the north-east, on the frontier of *Ṭabaristān*: the fortifications on the rivers *Kālār* and *Čālūs*.

*Language and religion*. The name of the king *Mūtā* (?) sounds unusual, but when in the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. Daylamite chiefs appear on the stage in large numbers, their names are clearly pagan Iranian, not of the south-western "Persian" type, but of the north-western variety: thus *Gōrāngēdj* (not *Kūrānkidj*, as formerly deciphered) corresponds to Persian *gōr-angēz* "chaser of wild asses", *Shēr-zil* to *shēr-dil* "lion's heart", etc. *Iṣṭakhrī*, 205, distinguishes between Persian and Daylamī and adds that in the highlands of *Daylam* there was a tribe that spoke a language different from that of *Daylam* and *Gilān*.

There may have been some *Zoroastrians* and *Christians* in *Daylam*, but practically nothing is known about the pagan creed of the Daylamites. According to *Bīrūnī*, (*al-Āthār*, 224) they followed the law established by the mythical *Afrīdūn* who ordered men to be masters in their family and called them *kadhkhudhā*. Rather enigmatically *Bīrūnī* adds that this institution was abrogated by the 'Alid \**al-Nāṣir al-Uṭrūsh* (see below) and thus they reverted to the condition in which people were living in the time of the tyrant *Ḍaḥḥāk Biwarāsp*, when "devils and demons" (*al-shayāṭin wa 'l-marada*) dwelt in their houses and they were powerless against them.

Apart from the *kadhkhudhās* exercising the rights of *pater familias*, the Daylamites had their local rulers of whose existence we can judge by such titles as *Wardān-shāh*, *wahriz* (cf. *Hübschmann*, *Armen. Gramm.*, 78: *vahrič-i vahričay* "vahriz of Vahriz"), and even kings (see above, *Mūtā*). The rôle of the latter becomes clearer only in the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. in connexion with their collaboration with the 'Alids.

The 'Alids. At an early date the mountain fastnesses of Daylam served as places of refuge for the 'Alids who had been obliged to flee from the 'Abbāsids. The earliest known refugee was Yahyā b. 'Abd Allāh, whose two brothers had been executed and who himself joined a rebel brother of Hārūn al-Rashīd. He came to Daylam in 175/791, but soon surrendered to the Barmakid Faḍl b. Yahyā. It appears that in the meantime the caliph used pressure on the king of Daylam both by threats and by offers of money (cf. Ṭabarī, *anno* 176; Ya'kūbī, ii, 462).

The Djuṣṭānids. When in 189/805 Hārūn arrived in Rayy he summoned the rulers of the Caspian region and let the lord of Daylam, Marzubān b. Djuṣṭān, go with a gift of money and a robe of honour; no payment of tribute is mentioned in this case, while such an obligation was imposed on the other kings. Although this is the first time that we hear of the family of Djuṣṭān, it is likely that the leniency of Hārūn had a connexion with the events of 175/791 when the same king (or his father?) must have been the ruler. Provisionally we can take Marzubān as the first in the list of the ruling *Banū Djuṣṭān*.

The next king known to us is Wahsūdān b. Djuṣṭān; the interval between Marzubān (who is mentioned in 189/805) and Wahsūdān (who was still living in 259/872, cf. Ṭabarī, iii, 188) is too great to consider them as brothers. The consensus (Justi, Vasmer, Kasrawī, Kazwīnī) is now to insert between them Djuṣṭān I (No. 2), putative son of No. 1, Marzubān, and father of No. 3, Wahsūdān. In fact under 201/816 Ṭabarī reports that 'Abd Allāh b. Khuradādhbih in the course of his victorious campaign in Daylam captured a king called Abū Laylī. Laylī (or Lili) is known in Daylam as a man's name (cf. the adventurer Laylī b. Nu'mān), and the question is whether he is identical with Djuṣṭān (no. 2) or whether he was a usurper or a local ruler (of Lāhidjān?).

The situation in Daylam becomes clearer with the advent on the frontier of Daylam of the line of Ḥasanid sayyids, clever politicians and able warriors who succeeded in involving the Daylamites in their struggles and schemes, although no obligation of professing Islam had yet been imposed on them.

Sayyid Ḥasan b. Zayd *al-dā'i al-kabīr* (no. 1) stood at the head of a rising in Čālūs and Kalār in 250/864 and protected the inhabitants against the Ṭāhirid governor who wished to appropriate the common lands which served for collecting fuel and as grazing grounds (Ṭabarī, iii, 1524). According to Iṣṭakhṛī, 205, before the time of Ḥasan b. Zayd, Daylam had been considered as the 'territory of unbelief' (*Dār al-kufr*) from which slaves had been taken, but the 'Alids had intervened on behalf of the Daylamites. Wahsūdān b. Djuṣṭān (no. 3) swore allegiance to Ḥasan b. Zayd, but soon after broke with him and died.

The *Ta'rikh-i Dīl wa Daylam* (quoted by Djuwaynī, iii, 271) reports that in 246/860 a Djuṣṭānīd began the construction of a building (*'imāra*) on Mt. Alamūt, in which the kings of Daylam took pride. It is more likely that this enterprise marked not the end of the long reign of Wahsūdān but the beginning of that of his energetic son Djuṣṭān II (no. 4). The latter invited the *dā'i* to send his representatives to Daylam, and under the auspices of the 'Alids took Rayy from the Ṭāhirids and occupied Kazwīn and Zandjān. In 253/867 the caliph al-Mu'tazz sent an army under Mūsā b. Bughā, who

wiped out the successes of Djuṣṭān. In 259/872 the latter made a second, though unsuccessful, attempt to occupy Rayy, and continued to assist the *dā'i* in his struggle against the Ṣāffārids. In 270/883 Ḥasan b. Zayd died and was succeeded by his brother Muḥammad b. Zayd, called *al-dā'i al-ṣaghīr*, to whom also Djuṣṭān swore allegiance (no. II).

The worst experience befell Daylam ca. 276/889 when the Khurāsānī soldier of fortune Rāfi' b. Harṭhama, acting on behalf of the Sāmānids, ousted Muḥammad b. Zayd from Djuṣṭān. The *dā'i* sought refuge in Daylam. The troops of Rāfi' occupied Čālūs, but the sayyid, assisted by Djuṣṭān, surrounded them. Then Rāfi' himself moved forward. Muḥammad b. Zayd retreated to Gilān, while on the heels of Djuṣṭān Rāfi' marched from Čālūs to Talakān, and for three months (summer of 278/891) this region was plundered by the invaders. Djuṣṭān gave a promise not to assist the sayyid, and Rāfi' went on to occupy Kazwīn and Rayy (see Ibn al-Aṭhīr, vii, 303, and Ibn Isfandiyyār, ed. Eghbal, 252-4). In 279/892 Rāfi', seeing himself threatened from many sides, suddenly swore allegiance to the *dā'i* and returned Djuṣṭān to him, on the understanding that he would send him 4000 Daylamite stalwarts. By threats and promises the Ṣāffārid 'Amr b. Layṭh prevented the *dā'i* from helping Rāfi' and the latter had to flee to Kh'ārizm where he was killed in 283/November 896. Four years later (287/October 900) Muḥammad b. Zayd fell in a battle against a Sāmānid commander.

After a short interval the 'Alid cause was taken up by the Ḥusaynid Ḥasan b. 'Alī (Nāṣir al-Dīn, al-Thā'ir, al-Uṭrūsh "the deaf" (no. III), who despite the shortness of his reign (301-4/904-7) is regarded as the greatest of the 'Alid rulers. According to Ṭabarī (iii, 2296) the world had never known such justice as that of al-Uṭrūsh. He had lived for thirteen years among the Daylamites, and succeeded in converting to the Zaydī creed a considerable number of people "between the farther (eastern) side of the Saḡd-rūd and Āmul". To confirm this achievement al-Uṭrūsh had the fortifications of Čālūs razed to the ground. He was recognized by Djuṣṭān, and although their first campaign against the Sāmānids was a failure, the next year, after a pitched battle of forty days, the Sāmānids were driven out of the Caspian provinces.

The enigmatic phrase of Birūnī, referred to above, concerning Nāṣir's action in disrupting the ancient authority of the *kadhkhudhā* may hint at the influence of Islamic institutions which had established control over isolated households. Such a trend of events must have been resented by the Djuṣṭānids, and some historians (Awliyā' Āmulī, *Ta'rikh-i Rūyān* (750/1349), ed. Tehran, 77; Ibn Wāṣil, *al-Ta'rikh al-Ṣālihi* in Dorn, *Muhamm. Quellen z. Gesch. d. Kasp. Meeres*, iv, 474) mention a period of struggles between Djuṣṭān and Nāṣir, though apparently before the latter's advent in 301/913. He died on 5 Ṣhā'bān 304/31 January 917, after having appointed as his successor his son-in-law, the Ḥasanid Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim (no. IV).

At about the same time, after a reign of forty years, Djuṣṭān was assassinated. The perpetrator of this crime was his brother 'Alī b. Wahsūdān (no. 5), whom in 300/912 the 'Abbāsids had already appointed their financial agent (*ista'mala*) in Iṣfahān. He was dismissed in 304, but in 307/919 the 'Abbāsīd commander Mu'nis, who had just taken prisoner Yūsuf b. Abi 'l-Sāḡī, reappointed 'Alī as the governor of Rayy, Kazwīn, and Zandjān. In the same year he

was killed in Kāzwin by Muḥammad b. Musāfir (Kangarī, or Sallārī, of the second Daylamite dynasty of Tārom), who being married to the clever *Kharā-sūya*, daughter of *Ḍiustān* b. Wahsūdān (no. 4) wished to avenge his father-in-law (not his "nephew", as in Ibn al-Aṭhīr, viii, 76). With his political attitude, 'Alī b. Wahsūdān could hardly have been recognized in the whole of Daylam. However, we learn that when the Ḥasanid Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim (the *dā'i* no. IV) was captured in Ṭabaristān and delivered to 'Alī to be sent to Baghdād, 'Alī had him imprisoned in his "ancestral fortress" of Alamūt (see Ibn Isfandiyyār, ed. Eghbal, 281). Immediately after 'Alī's death, his other brother *Khusraw* Firūzān, who apparently had acted as 'Alī's *locum tenens*, released the sayyid. *Khusraw* Firūzān (no. 6) marched against Ibn Musāfir but was killed by him. *Khusraw*'s son Maḥdī (no. 7) also took up arms against the Kangarid, but was defeated and took refuge with the new rising star of Daylam, Asfār b. *Shirōya* or *Shirawayh* [q.v.].

The epigons. With this event (ca. 315/927) ends our direct information about the *Ḍiustānids*, but remnants of the dynasty may still have carried on, at least in a part of their dominions. When Ibn Musāfir had dealt with his *Ḍiustānid* opponents (nos. 5, 6, 7), the former amīrs of the 'Alids and *Ḍiustānids* had already spread over the Iranian plateau, and Daylam proper lay at the mercy of Ibn Musāfir. In a report in which an official (some time before 379/989) summed up the history of *Shamīrān* (Tārom) for the Būyid minister Ibn 'Abbād (see Yāqūt, iii, 149-50, as explained by Kasrawī, i, 130-4), he states that the Musāfirid ruled over the whole of the mountainous \**Ustāniya* and (thus?) appropriated a part of Daylam, whereas the descendants of Wahsūdān (no. 3) b. *Ḍiustān* had to content themselves with the region of \**Lā'idjiya*. The same terms appear in the anti-Daylamite and pro-Turkish tract which the secretary Ibn Ḥassūl presented (ca. 450/1058) to al-Kunduri, the *wazīr* of Tughril-beg (see *Faḍā'il al-Atrāk*, ed. 'A. al-'Azzāwī, *Bellefen*, iv/14-5, (1940) 31). Ibn Ḥassūl explains that \**Ostān* is the highlands, and \**Lā'idjī* (wrongly printed *Lāndjī*) the lowlands of Daylam, the former being in the possession of the Wahsūdānid (here Kangarid) governors, and the latter in the possession of the *Ḍiustānid* kings. These independent reports indicate that soon after the death of *Ḍiustān* b. Wahsūdān (no. 4) his possessions were split up and the Wahsūdānids (here children of the Kangarid Wahsūdān b. Muḥammad of Tārom) had taken possession of the highlands of Daylam (presumably the "*ostān*", i.e., "home, centre" of the *Ḍiustānids*). The latter must have migrated to the neighbourhood of *Lāhidjān* (i.e., the coastal area of Daylam, of which ten districts are enumerated in the *Hudūd*).

On the contrary, when Sulṭān Tughril was operating near Kāzwin (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, anno 434/1042) the king of Daylam appeared before him with a tribute; then separately Ibn al-Aṭhīr mentions the submission of the *Sallār* of Ṭarm (Tārom). We have to conclude either that the *Ḍiustānids* had succeeded in reoccupying a part of their dominions, or that the tribute was paid by the *Lāhidjān* branch. The latter surmise is more likely, for Nāṣir-i *Khusraw* in his *Safar-nāma* states that in 438/1046 a levy (*bādī*) was collected at the crossing of the *Shāh-rūd* (near its confluence with the *Safid-rūd*) on behalf of the *amīr-i amīrān* who was "(one) of the kings of Daylamān". Nāṣir describes then his visit to *Shamīrān* whose ruler bore the title of "Marzubān al-Daylam *Ḍijl-i Ḍijlān* (sic)

Abū Šāliḥ"; his name was *Ḍiustān* Ibrāhīm and he possessed "many castles in Daylam". This must have been the great-grandson of Wahsūdān of Tārom (see *Musāfirids*), and it appears as though the *bādī* on the *Shāh-rūd* was levied also in his name.

The story of the *dā'is* ends with the rule of the above-mentioned Ḥasanid Ḥasan b. Kāsim (no. IV), son-in-law (*khatn*) of al-Uṭrūsh. Although he was nominated by Nāṣir himself, struggles for the succession began between him and the sons of Nāṣir, and after the death of the latter the Daylamite amīrs, involved in complicated struggles, fought for their own supremacy. Ḥasan b. Kāsim was killed ca. 316/928 by Mardāwīj b. Ziyār, then the ally of Asfār b. *Shirōya*.

Daylamite expansion. The result of the 'Alids' activities was that the Daylamites, partly converted to the Zaydī creed, developed strong oppositionary tendencies with regard to the caliphate, and that in their numerous fights for the 'Alids they greatly improved their military skill and became conscious of their strength. The revolts of the *Sājjid* Yūsuf b. Dīwdād (in 295/907 and in 304-7/916-9) and his final recall before his death in 315/928 opened the field for a chaotic succession in Rayy of Sāmānid governors, Turkish slaves, and 'Alids of Daylam. An important branch of the Musāfirids of Tārom had expanded towards *Ādhar-baydān* and Transcaucasia (see Minorsky in *BSOAS*, xv/3, 1953, 514-29), while quite new elements appeared on the central plateau of Irān: first Asfār b. *Shirōya* who ca. 315/927 had proclaimed himself king, then the Ziyārīds (316-434/928-1042), for a short time in Rayy in Iṣfahān, and later in the south-eastern corner of the Caspian Sea whither they had had to withdraw under the impact of the more important Būyids [q.v.]. This period is known to us through such sources as Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, ix, 4-15; Miskawayh, in *Eclipse*; Ibn Isfandiyyār, ed. Eghbal, 224-301, tr. Browne, 162-223; and such subsidiary mentions as are found in the historians of the Sāmānids, cf. Gardīzī, *Zayn al-akhbār*; Ibn Faḡlān, in his *Rihla*, etc.

Having occupied the major part of the Iranian plateau (except *Khurāsān* held by the Sāmānids) the Būyids, who rose in 320/932, occupied Baghdād in 334/946, and for 109 years held the caliph under their 'Alid tutelage. Under their shadow a great number of local dynasties of Iranian origin (Daylamite and Kurdish) sprang up in the peripheral areas: the Musāfirids; the Kurdish *Shaddādis* of Gandja (340-409/951-1018) and their branch of Ani (451-559/1059-1163); the *Kākūyids* [q.v.] of Hamadān and Iṣfahān (398-443/1007-51); the Kurdish *Ḥasanūyids* [see *ḤASANAWAYHIDS*] in the region of Kirmānshāh (348-406/959-1015); the Kurdish 'Annāzids [q.v.] in Hulwān and on the western slopes of the Zagros (381-511/991-1117); the Kurdish Marwānids [q.v.] of Mayyāfāriḳin and Diyārbakr (380-478/990-1085), etc. The weakness of the Daylamite régime consisted in the dispersion of the not too numerous elements of Daylam over too vast an area; the splitting up of the dynasty into several rival branches; and finally the Turko-Daylamite antagonism in the army (see below). The first great blow to the Būyid power was the occupation of Rayy by the *Ghaznawid* Maḥmūd in 420/1029; the definite end came under the impact of Tughril-beg who in 447/1055 arrested the last Būyid of Baghdād, al-Malik al-Rahīm. In Fārs, the last scions of the Būyid house carried on for a few more years as vassals of the *Saldjūks*, (see Bowen in *JRAS*, 1929, 229-45). Outside their

country, the Daylamites continued to serve as mercenaries. Nizām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāma*, ch. xix, still recommends the employment of 100 Daylamites together with 100 Khurāsānians as palace guards of the Saldjūqs. Isolated colonies of Daylamites survived in many places before they were absorbed by the local populations.

**Toponymy.** The area over which generations of Daylamites scattered throughout the ages is very wide, but, in view of the chronological difficulties involved, it is better to combine the references under a single heading. Thus the Babylonian name of the island of Dilmun (Bahrayn) still merits consideration, while the name of Bandar-i Daylam on the southern coast of Fārs seems to date back to the Būyid period. In the sub-Caucasian region the existence of military settlements of the Sāsānian times is reflected in such names as Layzān or Lā'izān (now Lahījī) connected with Lāhījān. The name of Shīrwān is probably linked with that of Shīr (in Arabic Shīrīz) lying at the confluence of the rivers of Ṭalākān and Alamūt, cf. *Hudūd*, ch. xxxii, § 24, and *Ḍiwaynī*, iii, 425 (note of M. Ḳazwīnī). Even the title of the king of Sarīr (Avaria) figuring in Balādhuri, 196, as Wahrarzān-shāh, may prove to be linked with the title *wahriz*, cf. Minorsky, *History of Sharvān*, 1958, 23-5. The so-called "Zāzā", living north of Diyārbakr up to Pālū and Darsim and still speaking an Iranian language, call themselves *Dimlā*, which name F. C. Andreas identified with Daylam. The (now Turkicized) tribe Dumbulī, active in the region of Khoy by the beginning of the 19th century, seems also to be connected with the Dimlā. It is noteworthy that Agathias, iii, 17, speaking of the *Dilimnitai* troops fighting in Lāsica, says that their homes (perhaps of that particular group?) lay in the neighbourhood of Persian lands "on the middle course of the Tigris", i.e., (if the "Tigris" is not a mistake for the Safid-rūd) in the region where the Zāzā live nowadays. The traveller Abū Dulaf, ed. Minorsky, Cairo 1955, § 25, mentions a place called Daylamastān at seven *farsakhs* east of Shahrāzūr whence "in the days of the ancient kings of Persia" the Daylamites used to send their raiding parties into the Mesopotamian lowlands. The borough of Daylamān lying west of Lāhījān may be the witness of the transfer of the Daylamite centre from \*Ostān (see above) to the region of Lāhījān. North-west of Lake Urmīya the centre of Salmās was until recently called Dilmakān; south-west of Lake Urmīya near an important Zagros pass one finds a district called Lāhījān (see *SĀWJ-BULAK* in *ET*). Several other villages bearing the name Lāhījān are known in the basin of Lake Urmīya, north of Mt. Savalan (Lāhī), etc.

**Territory and peoples.** The earlier Muslim geographers, such as Ibn Khuradādhbih, Ya'qūbī, Ibn Rusta, Ibn Faḳīh, have little to say on Daylam, but ample information on the country and its inhabitants is supplied by the geographers and historians after the rise of the Daylamite dynasties in the 4th/10th century. Already Iṣṭakhṛī had described under Daylam all the southern coast of the Caspian and the lands forming a belt to the south of the Alburz range (including Rayy and Ḳazwīn). Muḳaddasī (who lived in the heyday of the Daylamite dominion) adds to it all the coasts of the Caspian comprising the Khazar kingdom at the estuary of the Volga.

Iṣṭakhṛī (possibly following Balkhī) places the capital of the Ḍiustān family at Rūdhbār. The editor of *Ḍiwaynī*, iii, 434, M. Ḳazwīnī, has presen-

ted weighty arguments for identifying it with the Rūdhbār of Alamūt, which would mark the latter valley as the home (*ostān*) of the dynasty of Daylam. In Ibn Hawḳal's text, which is mainly based on Iṣṭakhṛī, the capital of the Ḍiustānids is placed at al-Tarm, which is a slip probably on the part of a scribe or reader, for al-Tarm (Tārom) was the capital not of the Ḍiustānids but of the later Musāfirids [q.v.]. More complicated is the identification of B.rwān, which according to Muḳaddasī, 360, was the capital (*ḳaṣaba*) of Daylam. The place was devoid of amenity, as opposed to the fertile Ṭalākān (in the Shāh-rūd valley) which in the author's opinion would have been more suitable for the capital. The residence of the government (*mustakharr al-sultān*), in B.rwān, was called Shahr-istān, where the treasure was kept in a deep well (Zahīr al-Dīn spells Shahr-astān, perhaps Shahr-\*Ostān "the town of Ostān", see above). Muḳaddasī names separately Samīrūm (*sic*) the capital of the Salāarwand rulers (Musāfirids) of the Tārom region, and *Khāsham* the town of the 'Alid *dā'is*, in eastern Gilān, situated by a bridge.

Iṣṭakhṛī, 205, describes the Daylamites as lean, having "light" (probably "fluffy") hair, rash, and inconsiderate. They practised agriculture and had herds but no horses. According to Muḳaddasī, 368-9, the Daylamites were good-looking and wore beards. Some valuable data on "Daylam proper" and Gilān are given in the *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, ch. xxxii, §§ 24-5: Daylam consisted of ten districts in the Caspian lowlands, and three, \*Wustān, Shīr (apparently Shīrīz of the Arabic sources), and Pazhm, in the mountains.

**Customs.** Many habits and customs of the Daylamites struck the contemporary authors. Their men were extremely hardy and capable of enduring great privations (Miskawayh, *Eclipse*, i, 140). Particularly mentioned among their armament are javelins (*zhopīn*) and tall shields painted in gay colours and carried by assistant lads. Set side by side these shields formed a wall against the attackers. Special men throwing javelins with burning naphtha (*mazārīkh al-naft wa 'l-nirān*) were also used in their army (see *Eclipse*, i, 282). A poetical description of Daylamite warfare is given in Gurgānī's *Wis wa Rāmin*, ed. Minovi, ch. xcix. The great disadvantage of the Daylamites was their lack of cavalry; they were obliged to operate jointly with Turkish mercenaries (whose armament was more complete, *Eclipse*, ii, 336) and basic rivalry between them disrupted the army.

Reference is often made to the extravagance of the Daylamite lamenting over their dead, and even over themselves in misfortune (Muḳaddasī, 369; *Eclipse*, ii, 162; iii, 260). In 352/963 Mu'izz al-Dawla introduced public mourning (*niyāha*) in Baghdād for the *imām* Ḥusayn (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, viii, 406; Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, tr. Margoliouth, 219; but see Hilāl b. Muḥassin on the temporary character of the performance, *Eclipse*, iii, 458, *sub* 393), and this institution may be responsible for the later Persian *ta'ziyas* in the month of Muḥarram (cf. A. E. Krīmskiy, *Perskiy teatr*, Kiev 1921).

Ca. 200 A.D. the Syrian sage Bardesanes reports that the women of Gilān work in the fields (*Leges regionum*, *Patrologia Syriaca*, ii/1, 1907, ed. F. Nau, 586). Eight centuries later the author of the *Hudūd* writes that the Daylam womenfolk are engaged in agriculture like men. According to Rūdhṛawārī, *Eclipse*, iii, 313, they were "equals of men in strength of mind, force of character, and participation in the

management of affairs". The Daylamites practised endogamy within their tribes, and marriages were concluded by direct agreement between the parties (Muḥaddasī, 368-9).

The Ismā'īlīs. The Fātimid Ismā'īlī propaganda had been rampant in the environs of Rayy even since the beginning of the 3rd/9th century (see S. M. Stern, in *BSOAS*, xxiii, 1960, 56-90). Asfār of Daylam and Mardāwīdj of Gilān had accepted the new teaching (Baghdādī, *Farq*, tr. A. Halkin, Tel-Aviv 1935, 113; Raṣḥīd al-Dīn, *Ismā'īliyyān*, ed. Dānīshpazhūh, Tehrān 1338/1959, 12). Under the last Būyids the Daylamites in Fārs adhered to the doctrine of the Seven Imāms, and the penultimate Būyid Marzubān Abū Kālīdjār (d. 440/1048) lent his ear to the preacher al-Mu'ayyad who was finally expelled from Fārs (*Sirat al-Mu'ayyad fi 'l-Dīn*, Cairo 1949, 43, 64; cf. *Fārs-nāma*, 115). The strong position of Daylam and the oppositionary tendencies of the population naturally attracted Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāh, who first sent his propagandists into Daylam, and then in 483/1090 seized the town of Alamūt, which was then held by an 'Alid called Mahdī as a fief from Malik-shāh (Djuwaynī, iii, 174). Thus for the next 166 years the great stronghold of Daylam was transformed into a danger-spot on the very doorstep of Saldjūk territory and a threat to the whole Sunnī world. The efforts of the Saldjūks to liquidate Alamūt were unsuccessful, but they caused much harm to the population; cf. the expedition of Arslan-taṣh in 485/1092, that of the son of Niẓām al-Mulk in 503/1109, that of Shīrghir before 511/1117. The last reminiscence of the Būyids in Daylam is Djuwaynī's report, iii, 239, on the deed of one of their scions, Ḥasan b. Nāmāwar, who in 561/1166 stabbed to death the master of the Ismā'īlīs because, despite his being his brother-in-law, he disliked his propaganda.

The Mongols and after. The total destruction of the fortresses of the Assassins (Alamūt, Lamassar, Maymūn-diz) by the troops of Hulāgū in 654/1256, and the extermination of the followers of the last master of the Assassins, dealt a terrible blow to the original highlanders of Daylam. The Shāh-rūd valley became easily accessible from Qazwīn (cf. the account of the operations of Öldjeytū Khān, who in 706/1307 invaded Gilān and reached Lāhīdjān; *Ta'rikh-i Uljāyṭū*, Bibl. Nat., Supp. 4197, fol. 42v).

At a later period the highlands of Daylam were more or less controlled by the dynasty of the *kār-kīyā* of eastern Gilān (Biyapīsh) whose centre was at Lāhīdjān. They gradually eliminated their Hazāraspī princes of Ashkawar, the last scions of the Ismā'īlīs of Alamūt, and the clan of Kūshīdj of Daylamān and Rūdhbār. In 819/1416 the sayyid Raḍī of Lāhīdjān invited the Daylamites to the bank of the Safid-rūd and had two or three thousand of them murdered with their chiefs (Zahr al-Dīn, *Ta'rikh-i Gilān*, ed. Rabino, Raṣḥt 1330, 57, 118, 122-6).

The most recent movement in the history of Daylam is the uprising of the Ahl-i Haḳḳ [q.v.] leader Sayyid Muḥammad in Kalār-daṣḥt in October 1891 (see Minorsky, *Notes sur la secte des Ahl-e-Haqq*, Paris 1920-1, 51).

No complete enquiries have been carried out on the population of Daylam proper, but H. Rabino, *Le Guilan*, 280, states that the original Daylamites are found only in Kalārdeh and Čawsāl (in winter) and in Kalāč-khānī (in summer). The inhabitants of Daylamān (south-west of Lāhīdjān) have sold their lands and now live at Barfīdjān (mentioned in the *Hudūd* as a canton in the lowlands of Daylam).

**Bibliography:** Given in the course of the article. The *Ta'rikh-i Dīl wa Daylam*, dedicated to the Būyid Fakhr al-Dawla (who according to G. C. Miles ruled in Rayy 373-87/984-97), and used by Djuwaynī, iii, 270, is now lost. No Djuṣṭānīd coins have yet been discovered. Marquart., *Erānshahr*, 126-7; H. L. Rabino, *Les provinces Caspiennes*, in *RMM*, xxxii, 1915-6, 227-384 (Daylamān, Lāhīdjān, Rān-i kūh); R. Vasmer, *Zur Chronologie d. Gāstaniden*, in *Isl.*, iii/2, 1927, 165-86, and 483-5; A. Kasrawī, *Pādshāhān-i gumnām*, 1928, i, 23-37 (Djuṣṭāniyyān) — a valuable work; V. Minorsky, *La domination des Daylamites*, Soc. des Études Iranienues, no. iii, 1932, 1-26; M. Qazwīnī, annotations to Djuwaynī, iii, 306-9 ('Alids), 432-45 (Djuṣṭānīds); *IA*, s.v. Deilem (A. Ateş). (V. MINORSKY)

**DAYN** [see SUPPLEMENT].

**DAYR**, a word of Syriac origin denoting the Christian monasteries which continued to function after the Arab conquest of the Middle East. If we are to believe the lists drawn up by Arab writers, they were very numerous, particularly in 'Irāk (along the Tigris and Euphrates valleys), Upper Mesopotamia, Syria (Stylite sanctuaries in the vicinity of the "dead cities"), Palestine and Egypt (along the whole length of the Nile valley). They were often named after a patron saint (Dayr Mār Yuḥannā near Takrīt, Dayr Sam'ān in northern Syria) or founder (Dayr 'Abdūn in 'Irāk), but also occasionally after the nearest town or village (Dayr al-Ruṣāfa in Syria) or a feature of the locality (Dayr al-a'lā near Mosul, Dayr al-Za'farān in Upper Mesopotamia). Monks, called *dayyār* or *dayrānī*, lived in the *dayrs* (also known in 'Irāk as *umr*, a word of uncertain origin). The monasteries were often no more than simple hermitages, particularly if they were located in remoter parts. Usually however they consisted of several buildings—a church (*kanīsa* or *bī'a*), cells (*kiliya*, pl. *kalālī*, or *kīrh*, pl. *akrāh* and *ukayrah*, words of Syriac origin, the second being strictly speaking 'Irākī), and outbuildings such as shops and inns. The *dayr* in fact constituted a centre of agricultural development, and drew revenue from the lands which were cultivated to meet its needs (vineyards, olive groves and palm plantations). Hermitages and convents were made defensible either by the construction of fortifications or by the careful choice of site (e.g., on mountain-sides, or even set into the rock face and thus cut off from normal means of entry).

The Christian monasteries were centres of religious and intellectual life during the early years of Islam. For instance, the liturgical rules adopted in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries by the Nestorian church were formulated in the Dayr al-a'lā of Mosul (see J. M. Fiey, *Mossoul chrétienne*, Beirut 1959, 126-32). They also played an important role in diffusing the works of classical Greece, generally translated into Syriac and then into Arabic, and in some instances they built up large libraries, such as the notable collection in St. Catherine's monastery on Mount Sinai (see A. S. Atiya, *The Arabic manuscripts of Mount Sinai*, Baltimore 1955). Furthermore, some 'Irākī monasteries and the Christian communities attached to them proved an important source of official clerks in 'Abbāsīd times. They took part in the administration of the empire, and if they adopted the Islamic faith they even had the right to be appointed vizier (see DAYR KUNNĀ).

The monasteries were also an important factor in the political and social life of the Islamic world.